

### REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 15, and 19 were amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant's attorney and the Examiner discussed the application by telephone on September 7, 2004 and also on September 21, 2004. Applicants, through their attorney, express appreciation to the Examiner for granting these opportunities for discussion and for his helpful comments. A Statement of Substance of the Interview provided by Applicants is enclosed herewith.

#### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,654,906 to Arndt. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the discussion between the Examiner and Applicants' attorney, Claim 1 has been amended to recite features disclosed in the application at page 18, lines 15-27, which refers to **Figure 5**. Claim 1 as now amended reads as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A method of managing system reset interrupts, wherein an associated processor has a return control instruction, said method comprising:
  - receiving a system reset interrupt for a logical partition;
  - determining if an operation on the logical partition is being performed at the time the system reset interrupt is received;
  - deferring handling of the system reset interrupt until after the operation on the logical partition is completed; and
  - changing the return control instruction to a branch instruction that branches to a routine for simulating the system reset interrupt, when the operation is a hypervisor call.

Amended Claim 1 is considered to distinguish over the Arndt reference, particularly in reciting, in the over-all combination of Claim 1, the step of "changing the return control instruction to a branch instruction that branches to a routine for simulating the system reset interrupt". Applicants believe that this step is neither shown nor suggested by the Arndt reference. Arndt is not concerned with delaying or deferring reset interrupts, and would thus have no need for any such step or like teaching. Applicants

believe further that the Examiner concurs with their conclusion the Claim 1 as amended now overcomes the Arndt reference.

Independent Claims 8 and 15 have respectively been amended to recite features similar to those now recited by amended Claim 1, and are thus considered to patentably distinguish over the prior art for the same reasons given in support thereof.

Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 depend from independent Claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively, and are each considered to patentably distinguish over the prior art for the same reasons given in support thereof.

Claims 5, 12, and 19 have been amended in view of the amendments made to Claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively.

#### VII. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the Arndt reference and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: September 29, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



James Skarsten  
Reg. No. 28,346  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 367-2001  
Attorney for Applicants